arXiv:1602.01286v2 [math.CO] 2 Mar 2016

CONSTRUCTING DOMINATING SETS IN CIRCULANT GRAPHS

IGOR E. SHPARLINSKI

Abstract. We give an efficient construction of a reasonably small dominating set in a circulant graph on n notes and k distinct chord lengths. This result is based on bounds on some double exponential sums.

1. Introduction

We recall that a subset $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ of a graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ (directed or undirected) with the vertex set $\mathcal{V}$ and the edge set $\mathcal{E}$ is called *dominating* if for any $v \in \mathcal{V}$ there is an edge $(u, v) \in \mathcal{E}$ with $u \in \mathcal{D}$.

The smallest size of a dominating set of $\mathcal{G}$ is called *the domination number* of $\mathcal{G}$ and denoted by $\gamma(\mathcal{G})$.

Here we investigate dominating sets of circulant graphs. We remark that although this direction has been studied by several authors, see [2, 3, 6, 9, 10, 11] and references therein, no general bound on the domination number of a circulant graph is known.

For an integer $n \ge 2$ we use $\mathbb{Z}_n$ to denote the residue ring modulo n that we assume to be represented by the set $\{0, 1, \ldots, n-1\}$. Let $\widetilde{\mathbb{Z}}_n$ be the set of non-zero elements of $\mathbb{Z}_n$. Thus, for a prime $n = p$ we have $\widetilde{\mathbb{Z}}_p = \mathbb{Z}_p^*$, the set of invertible elements in $\mathbb{Z}_p$.

A *circulant graph* is a directed n-vertex graph with an automorphism that is an n-cycle. Circulant graphs may be constructed as follows. Given a set $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \widetilde{\mathbb{Z}}_n$ we define the graph $\mathcal{C}_n(\mathcal{S})$ to be the directed graph with the vertex set $\mathbb{Z}_n$ where for $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}_n$ there is an edge from i to j if and only if $i - j \in \mathcal{S}$. It is not difficult to see that $\mathcal{C}_n(\mathcal{S})$ is an n-vertex circulant graph of regularity $\#\mathcal{S}$.

We say that $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \widetilde{\mathbb{Z}}_n$ is *symmetric* if $s \in \mathcal{S}$ if and only if $n - s \in \mathcal{S}$. Then $\mathcal{C}_n(\mathcal{S})$ is an undirected circulant graph. Clearly every symmetric

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 05C25, 05C69, 11L07.

Key words and phrases. circulant graphs, dominating sets, exponential sums.

This work was supported in part by ARC Grant DP140100118.

set $\mathcal{S}$ of cardinality k can be represented as

$$\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{T} \bigcup (n - \mathcal{T}) = \{t_1, n - t_1, \ldots, t_m, n - t_m\} \tag{1}$$

for some set $\mathcal{T} = \{t_1, \ldots, t_m\} \subseteq \widetilde{\mathbb{Z}}_n$, with $m = \lceil k/2 \rceil$ (for an odd k we must have $n/2 \in \mathcal{S}$ and thus n has to be even).

Before we formulate our results, we recall that the notations $U = O(V)$, $U \ll V$ and $V \gg U$ are all equivalent to the assertion that the inequality $|U| \le c|V|$ holds for some constant $c > 0$. Throughout the paper, the implied constants in the symbols 'O', '$\ll$' and '$\gg$' are absolute.

As we obviously have $(\#\mathcal{D} + 1)\,\#\mathcal{S} \ge n$ for any dominating set $\mathcal{D}$, for any set $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \widetilde{\mathbb{Z}}_n$ of c ardinality k, we obtain

$$\gamma\left(\mathcal{C}_n(\mathcal{S})\right) \ge \frac{n}{k} - 1.$$

A random choice of $\mathcal{D}$ leads to the bound

$$\gamma\left(\mathcal{C}_n(\mathcal{S})\right) \ll \frac{n \log n}{k}, \tag{2}$$

see [1, Corollary 3.2] or [7, Theorem 2]. The proof of (2) given by Lorenz [7, Theorem 2] is probabilistic using a recursive choice of the dominating set $\mathcal{D}$. It can derandomised but it seems to lead to a construction with approximately $kn^{2+o(1)}$.

Here we show how to find a reasonably small dominating set in time $k^{1/2}n^{1+o(1)}$.

Theorem 1. *For any set $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \widetilde{\mathbb{Z}}_n$ of cardinality k, in time $k^{1/2}n^{1+o(1)}$, one can find a dominating set $\mathcal{D}$ for the graph $\mathcal{C}_n(\mathcal{S})$ of size*

$$\#\mathcal{D} \ll \frac{n(\log n)^{5/2}}{k^{1/2} \log\log n}.$$

One can naturally extend the definition of dominanting sets to r-dominanting sets of a a graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E})$ and say that $\mathcal{D}_r \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ is o r-dominanting an r-dominating set if i for any $v \in \mathcal{V}$ there is path of length at most r originating some $u \in \mathcal{D}$.

Theorem 2. *There is an absolute constant $C > 0$ such that for any integer k with*

$$n \ge k \ge Cn^{1/2} \frac{(\log n)^3}{\log\log n},$$

in time $k^{1/2}n^{1+o(1)}$, one can find a set $\mathcal{D}_2$ for the graph $\mathcal{C}_n(\mathcal{S})$ of size

$$\#\mathcal{D}_2 \ll \frac{n^2(\log n)^5}{k^2(\log\log n)^2},$$

which is a 2-dominating set for any graph $\mathcal{C}_n(\mathcal{S})$ *with* $\#\mathcal{S} \ge k$.

We remark that an interesting feature of Theorem 2 is that the set $\mathcal{D}_2$ is universal and does not depend on the set $\mathcal{S}$.

2. Preliminaries

We fix a positive integer parameter $L < n/2$ and let $\mathcal{L}$ be the set of primes $\ell \in [L+1, 2L]$ with $\gcd(\ell, n) = 1$. We define the set $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_n$ as

$$\mathcal{W} = \{k/\ell \pmod n \ : \ (k, \ell) \in [1, L] \times \mathcal{L}\}. \tag{3}$$

Lemma 3. *For* $L < 0.5n^{1/2}$ *we have* $\mathcal{W} = L\#\mathcal{L}$.

Proof. It is enough to show that

$$k_1/\ell_1 \not\equiv k_2/\ell_2 \pmod n$$

for any two distinct pairs $(k_1, \ell_1), (k_2, \ell_2) \in [1, L] \times \mathcal{L}$. Assuming that this fails, we obtain

$$k_1\ell_2 \equiv k_2\ell_1 \pmod n.$$

Since $1 \le k_1\ell_2, k_2\ell_1 \le 2L^2 < n$ we conclude that $k_1\ell_2 = k_2\ell_1$. Since $\max\{k_1, k_2\} \le L < \min\{\ell_1, \ell_2\}$ and ℓ_1, ℓ_2 are primes, this implies $(k_1, \ell_1) = (k_2, \ell_2)$ and concludes the proof. □

Let $\mathbf{e}_n(z) = \exp(2\pi i z/n)$.

We need the following bound of exponential sums, which is a modification of [8, Lemma 3].

Lemma 4. *For any* $a \in \widetilde{\mathbb{Z}}_n$ *we have*

$$\sum_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \mathbf{e}_n(aw) \ll L\frac{(\log n)^2}{\log\log n}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 3, it is enough to show that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{L} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{e}_n(ak/\ell) \ll L\frac{(\log n)^2}{\log\log n},$$

where the inversion in the argument of $\mathbf{e}_n$ is modulo n. Following the proof of [8, Lemma 3], we define

$$I = \lfloor \log(2n/L) \rfloor \qquad \text{and} \qquad J = \lfloor \log(2n) \rfloor.$$

Furthermore, for a rational number $\alpha = u/v$ with $\gcd(v,n) = 1$, we denote by $\rho_n(\alpha)$ the unique integer w with $w \equiv u/v \pmod n$ and $-n/2 < w \le n/2$ (we can assume that $n \ge 3$). Using the bound

$$\sum_{x=1}^{L} \mathbf{e}_n(\alpha x) \ll \min\left\{L, \frac{n}{|\rho_n(\alpha)|}\right\},$$

which holds for any rational α with the denominator which is relatively prime to n (see [5, Bound (8.6)]), we obtain a version of [8, Equation (1)]:

$$\sum_{k=1}^{L} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{e}_n(ak/\ell) \ll LR + n \sum_{j=I+1}^{J} T_j e^{-j}, \tag{4}$$

where

$$R = \#\left\{\ell \in \mathcal{L} \ : \ |\rho_n(a/\ell)| < e^I\right\},$$
$$T_j = \#\left\{\ell \in \mathcal{L} \ : \ e^j \le |\rho_n(a/\ell)| < e^{j+1}\right\}, \quad j = I+1, \ldots, J.$$

We note that if $|\rho_n(a/\ell)| < Z$ then $\ell z \equiv a \pmod n$ for some integer z with $0 < |z| < Z$. We can assume that $1 \le a \le n-1$. Thus $\ell z = a + nm$ for some integer m with $|m| < 2LZ/n$. Hence there are at most $O\left(LZ/n + 1\right)$ possible values of m and for each fixed $m \ll LZ/n$ there are at most $O(\log n/\log\log n)$ primes ℓ dividing $a + nm \ne 0$. Therefore, we obtain the estimates

$$R \ll \left(e^I L/n + 1\right) \log n/\log\log n,$$
$$T_j \ll \left(e^j L/n + 1\right) \log n/\log\log n, \quad j = I+1, \ldots, J.$$

In particular, recalling the definition of I, we see that

$$R \ll \log n/\log\log n,$$
$$T_j \ll \frac{e^j L \log n}{n \log\log n}, \quad j = I+1, \ldots, J.$$

Substituting these bounds in (4), we obtain

$$\sum_{k=1}^{L} \sum_{\ell \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbf{e}_n(ak/\ell) \ll L\frac{\log n}{\log\log n} + p \sum_{j=I+1}^{J} \frac{e^j L \log n}{n \log\log n} e^{-j}$$
$$\ll JL\frac{\log n}{\log\log n} \ll L\frac{(\log n)^2}{\log\log n},$$

which concludes the proof. □

It is interesting to note that neither the result nor the proof of Lemma 4 depend on $\gcd(a,n)$ and only require $a \not\equiv 0 \pmod n$.

Lemma 5. *Let $\mathcal{W}$ be given by (3) and let $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_n$ be an arbitrary set. Then the set $\mathcal{U}$ of $u \in \mathbb{Z}_n$ that cannot be represented as $u = s + w$ for $(s, w) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{W}$ is of cardinality*

$$\#\mathcal{U} \ll \frac{n^2 (\log n)^4}{\#\mathcal{S} (\#\mathcal{L})^2 (\log \log n)^2}.$$

Proof. Using the orthogonality of exponential functions, the number N of solutions to the equation

$$s + w - u = 0, \qquad (s, u, w) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{W},$$

(considered in the ring $\mathbb{Z}_n$) can be written as

$$N = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \sum_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{a \in \mathbb{Z}_n} \mathbf{e}_n(a(s + w - u)).$$

After changing the order of summation and separating the contribution $\#\mathcal{S}\#\mathcal{U}\#\mathcal{W}/n$ corresponding to $a = 0$, we obtain

$$N - \frac{\#\mathcal{S}\#\mathcal{U}\#\mathcal{W}}{n} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{a \in \widetilde{\mathbb{Z}}_n} \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbf{e}_n(as) \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \mathbf{e}_n(-au) \sum_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \mathbf{e}_n(aw).$$

We now note that by the definition of $\mathcal{U}$ we have $N = 0$. Therefore

$$\#\mathcal{S}\#\mathcal{U}\#\mathcal{W} \le \sum_{a \in \widetilde{\mathbb{Z}}_n} \left| \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbf{e}_n(as) \right| \left| \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \mathbf{e}_n(-au) \right| \left| \sum_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \mathbf{e}_n(aw) \right|.$$

Using Lemma 3, we derive

$$\#\mathcal{S}\#\mathcal{U}\#\mathcal{W} \ll L \frac{(\log n)^2}{\log \log n} \sum_{a \in \widetilde{\mathbb{Z}}_n} \left| \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbf{e}_n(as) \right| \left| \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \mathbf{e}_n(au) \right|. \tag{5}$$

Now, by the Cauchy inequality we obtain

$$\left(\sum_{a \in \widetilde{\mathbb{Z}}_n} \left| \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbf{e}_n(as) \right| \left| \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \mathbf{e}_n(au) \right| \right)^2 \le \sum_{a \in \widetilde{\mathbb{Z}}_n} \left| \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbf{e}_n(as) \right|^2 \sum_{a \in \widetilde{\mathbb{Z}}_n} \left| \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \mathbf{e}_n(au) \right|^2. \tag{6}$$

Furthermore, expanding the summation over a to $\mathbb{Z}_n$, we see that

$$\sum_{a \in \widetilde{\mathbb{Z}}_n} \left| \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbf{e}_n(as) \right|^2 \le \sum_{a \in \mathbb{Z}_n} \left| \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbf{e}_n(as) \right|^2 \tag{7}$$
$$= \sum_{a \in \mathbb{Z}_n} \sum_{s,t \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbf{e}_n(a(s-t)) = \sum_{a,b \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{a \in \mathbb{Z}_n} \mathbf{e}_n(a(s-t)) = n\#\mathcal{S}.$$

Similarly

$$\sum_{a \in \widetilde{\mathbb{Z}}_n} \left| \sum_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \mathbf{e}_n(au) \right|^2 \le n\#\mathcal{U}. \tag{8}$$

Substituting (7) and (8) in (6) and recalling (5) we derive

$$\#\mathcal{S}\#\mathcal{U}\#\mathcal{W} \ll nL\sqrt{\#\mathcal{S}\#\mathcal{U}}\frac{(\log n)^2}{\log\log n}.$$

Hence

$$\#\mathcal{U} \ll \frac{n^2L^2(\log n)^4}{\#\mathcal{S}(\#\mathcal{W})^2(\log\log n)^2}.$$

It remains to recall that by Lemma 3 we have $\#\mathcal{W} = L\#\mathcal{L}$. □

3. Proof of Theorem 1

To prove the upper bound, we define λ by the equation

$$\frac{n^2(\log\lambda)^2(\log n)^4}{k\lambda^2(\log\log n)^2} = \frac{\lambda^2}{\log\lambda}. \tag{9}$$

We now set $L = \lceil \lambda \rceil$ (and easily verify that $L < 0.5n^{1/2}$ for a sufficiently large n) and then define

$$\#\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{W},$$

where $\mathcal{U}$ is as in Lemma 5 and $\mathcal{W}$ is defined by (3). Clearly $\mathcal{D}$ is a dominating set of $\mathcal{C}_n(\mathcal{S})$.

We also note that since we always have $k < n$ the equation (9) implies that $L \ge \lambda > n^{1/4}$. Since the number of distinct prime divisors of n is $O(\log n/\log\log n)$, by the prime number theorem, we obtain

$$\frac{\lambda}{\log\lambda} \gg \frac{L}{\log L} \gg \#\mathcal{L} \gg \frac{L}{\log L} \gg \frac{\lambda}{\log\lambda}, \tag{10}$$

provided n is large enough.

By Lemmas 3 and 5

$$\#\mathcal{D} \ll L\#\mathcal{L} + \frac{n^2(\log n)^4}{\#\mathcal{S}(\#L)^2(\log\log n)^2}.$$

Using (10) and recalling the choice of λ given by (9), we have

$$\#\mathcal{D} \ll \frac{\lambda^2}{\log \lambda} + \frac{n^2 (\log \lambda)^2 (\log n)^4}{k \lambda^2 (\log \log n)^2} = 2 \frac{\lambda^2}{\log \lambda}.$$

On the other hand, we derive from (9) that

$$\frac{\lambda^4}{(\log \lambda)^2} = \frac{n^2 (\log n)^4 \log \lambda}{k (\log \log n)^2}.$$

Therefore, using $\lambda \le n$, we now derive

$$\frac{\lambda^2}{\log \lambda} \le \frac{n (\log n)^{5/2}}{k^{1/2} \log \log n},$$

which gives the desired upper bound on $\mathcal{D}$.

To see the time complexity bound, we first note that the set $\mathcal{W}$ can be constructed in time $L^2 n^{o(1)} = n^{1+o(1)}$, see [4] for the background on the complexity of computation. Then, for each $w \in cW$, we mark elements of $\mathbb{Z}_n$ of the form $w + S$ in time $kn^{o(1)}$. After this we collect all unmarked elements in the set $\mathcal{U}$, which concludes the proof.

4. Proof of Theorem 2

We now set

$$L = \left\lceil c \frac{n (\log n)^3}{k \log \log n} \right\rceil \tag{11}$$

for a sufficiently large c and then define

$$\#\mathcal{D}_2 = \mathcal{W}$$

where $\mathcal{W}$ is given by (3).

We now fix some set $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \widetilde{\mathbb{Z}}_n$, for any $u \in \mathbb{Z}_n$ for the number $N(u)$ of solutions to the equation

$$s + t + w - u = 0, \qquad (s, t, w) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{W},$$

(considered in the ring $\mathbb{Z}_n$) we have $N(u) > 0$.

Using the orthogonality of exponential functions, as in the proof of Lemma 5 we write

$$N(u) = \sum_{s,t \in \mathcal{S}} \sum_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{a \in \mathbb{Z}_n} \mathbf{e}_n(a(s + t + w - u)).$$

Again, changing the order of summation and separating the contribution $(\#\mathcal{S})^2 \#\mathcal{W}/n$ corresponding to $a = 0$, we obtain

$$N - \frac{(\#\mathcal{S})^2 \#\mathcal{W}}{n} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{a \in \widetilde{\mathbb{Z}}_n} \mathbf{e}_n(-au) \sum_{s,t \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbf{e}_n(a(s + t)) \sum_{w \in \mathcal{W}} \mathbf{e}_n(aw).$$

Hence, using Lemma 3,

$$\left|N(u) - \frac{(\#\mathcal{S})^2\#\mathcal{W}}{n}\right| \le \frac{1}{n}\sum_{a\in\widetilde{\mathbb{Z}}_n}\left|\sum_{s\in\mathcal{S}}\mathbf{e}_n(as)\right|^2\left|\sum_{u\in\mathcal{U}}\mathbf{e}_n(au)\right|$$
$$\ll L\frac{(\log n)^2}{n\log\log n}\sum_{a\in\widetilde{\mathbb{Z}}_n}\left|\sum_{s\in\mathcal{S}}\mathbf{e}_n(as)\right|^2.$$

Now, recalling (7), we obtain

$$N(u) - \frac{(\#\mathcal{S})^2\#\mathcal{W}}{n} \ll L\#\mathcal{S}\frac{(\log n)^2}{\log\log n}. \tag{12}$$

Thus, we see from (12) that there is a constant c_0 such that if

$$\frac{(\#\mathcal{S})^2\#\mathcal{W}}{n} > c_0L\#\mathcal{S}\frac{(\log n)^2}{\log\log n}. \tag{13}$$

Assume that L defined by (11) satisfies the inequality

$$L \le 0.5n^{1/2}, \tag{14}$$

thus Lemma 3 applies. Then, since $\#\mathcal{S} \ge k$, and also using (12), we see that it is enough to satisfy the condition

$$\#\mathcal{L} > c_0\frac{n(\log n)^2}{k\log\log n}.$$

Since, by the prime number theorem $\#\mathcal{L} \sim L/\log L$ (we again recall that n has $O(\log n/\log\log n)$ distinct prime divisors), choosing a sufficient large c in (11), we obtain the above inequality. We now also choose a sufficiently large C in the condition of Theorem 2 so that (14) holds as well.

It remains to note that all implied constants are effective and can easily be computed explicitly. Hence c and C can also be explicitly computed leading to the desired algorithm.

5. Comments

Clearly, the upper bound of Theorem 1 is nontrivial if

$$k \ge C\frac{(\log n)^5}{(\log\log n)^2}$$

for some constant $C > 0$. It is certainly interesting to lower this threshold.

We also note that the set $\mathcal{W}$ which "almost dominates" $\mathcal{C}_n(\mathcal{S})$ (that is, dominates all but $o(n)$ nodes) does not depend on $\mathcal{S}$. In fact,

Lemma 5 implies that for any function $\psi(z) \to \infty$ as $z \to \infty$, one can construct such a universal set $\mathcal{W}$ of size

$$\#\mathcal{W} \le \psi(n)\frac{n(\log n)^3}{k^{1/2}\log\log n},$$

which almost dominates all graphs $\mathcal{C}_n(\mathcal{S})$ with $\#\mathcal{S} \ge k$.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Imre Ruzsa and Ilya Shkredov for their valuable comments, in particular, for pointing out the bound (2) and the references [1, 7].

During the preparation of this paper, the was supported in part by ARC grant DP140100118.

References

[1] B. Bollobás, S. Janson and O. Riordan, 'On covering by translates of a set', *Rand. Struct. Alg.*, **38** (2011), 33–67.
[2] W. E. Clark, S. Suen and L. A. Dunning, 'Tight upper bounds for the domination numbers of graphs with given order and minimum degree', *Electron. J. Combin.*, **7** (2000), Paper 58, 1–19.
[3] I. J. Dejter and O. Serra, 'Efficient dominating sets in Cayley graphs', *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, **129**, (2003) 319–328.
[4] J. von zur Gathen and J. Gerhard, *Modern computer algebra*, 3rd ed., Cambridge University Press, 2013.
[5] H. Iwaniec and E. Kowalski, *Analytic number theory*, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2004.
[6] K. R. Kumar and G MacGillivray, 'Efficient domination in circulant graphs', *Discrete Math.*, **313** (2013), 767–771.
[7] G. G. Lorentz, 'On a problem of additive number theory', *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **5** (1954). 838–841.
[8] I. E. Shparlinski, 'Exponential sums with Farey fractions', *Bull. Polish Acad. Sci. Math.*, **57** (2009), 101–107.
[9] T. Tamizh Chelvam and S. Mutharasu, 'Total domination in circulant graphs', *Int. J. Open Problems Compt. Math.*, **4** (2011), 168–174.
[10] T. Tamizh Chelvam and S. Mutharasu, 'Efficient open domination in Cayley graphs', *Appl. Math. Lett.*, **25**, (2012) 1560–1564.
[11] T. Tamizh Chelvam and S. Mutharasu, 'Subgroups as efficient dominating sets in Cayley graphs', *Discr. Appl. Math.*, **161** (2013), 1187–1190.

Department of Pure Mathematics, University of New South Wales, Sydney, NSW 2052, Australia

E-mail address: igor.shparlinski@unsw.edu.au